DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 250 EA 027 317

AUTHOR Crews, Alton C.; Weakley, Sonya
TITLE Hungry for Leadership: Educational Leadership Programs in the SREB States.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; *Leadership Training; *Management Development; *Partnerships in Education; Professional Continuing Education; Professional Development; School Business Relationship; *State Action; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Southern Regional Education Board; *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

This report documents the status of leadership training in 15 states in the southern United States. It notes that the public push for increased accountability necessitates the preparation of leaders who can stimulate peak performance. The report offers information on the Southern Regional Education Board's Leadership Academy, which has identified the following components of effective leadership development: goal-setting; long-term interactive training; a personal plan of improvement; reflective thinking; coaching and mentoring; partnerships and collaborations; and comprehensive evaluation. The document offers a state-by-state review of educational leadership programs in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Leadership-development programs face challenges of building public support for leadership training, developing corporate connections, and committing to long-term investment. A list of state directors of leadership programs is appended. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 391 250

Hungry for Leadership:

Educational Leadership Programs in the SREB States

EA 027317

SREB Southern Regional Education Board

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hungry for Leadership:

Educational Leadership Programs in the SREB States

Alton C. Crews
Sonya Weakley

SREB 592 Tenth Street, N.W. • Atlanta, Georgia 30318-5790 • (404) 875-9211 • 1995
Southern Regional Education Board

Table of Contents

The Public Wants Schools with Strong Leaders 5

Leadership Development: The SREB Experience 12

The Challenges to Leadership Development 15

A State-by-State Review of Education Leadership Programs

Alabama 17

Arkansas 19

Florida 21

Georgia 23

Kentucky 26

Louisiana 28

Maryland 31

Mississippi 33

North Carolina 35

Oklahoma 37

South Carolina 40

Tennessee 41

Texas 43

Virginia 46

West Virginia 47

Appendix A: State Directors of Leadership Programs 49

Today's Schools Are Hungry for Leadership

Show me a good school and I'll show you a good school leader. When you poke into the inner workings of a successful school, you will find—without fail—a skillful leader who understands how to transform educational practice, not just transact educational business.

The flip side is also true. *Show me a school that is failing, and I'll show you a school hungry for leadership.*

Policymakers and "education engineers" have spent more than a decade looking for the magic bullet that will fix schools. Look no further. If leadership isn't the magic bullet, it's the oil that makes the mechanism fire. Put a strong leader in a troubled school, give that leader flexibility to make the important decisions, then watch that school rise to the top of the heap.

We've entered the "local era" of school reform in most of our Southern states. State leaders think it's time to move more decisionmaking to the front lines. Give local schools more control and hold them more accountable for results.

It's the right idea. But let me be the devil's advocate and ask a tough question: How many school administrators are ready to lead schools to the mountaintop? For those of us who've spent most of our lives around schools, the answer is pretty clear: *Not nearly enough.* If state policymakers expect local control to produce better schools, they're going to have to support programs that beef up the supply of genuine school leaders.

Some folks will argue that people are born to lead. I don't believe it. Leadership is not an accident of birth. Evidence abounds that leadership skills can be acquired on the job, struggling with problems in a live work setting *while also engaged in a structured leadership training program.* We can't train every educator to be a successful leader. But we can train more than enough to transform our schools.

If a structured training program can produce the education leaders we need, what's the problem? Why aren't we out there getting the job done?

One big problem is that many decisionmakers in our states *don't believe in leadership development.* They are willing to spend school improvement dollars on more teachers, or more technology, or more testing and assessment—but they don't show much enthusiasm for spending more money on leadership training.

This report was prepared by Alton Crews, Director of The SREB Leadership Academy, and Sonya Weakley. It is drawn from discussions at a meeting of professional development and leadership academy directors in the SREB states and additional interviews and research. It describes the status of leadership development programs in the 1995-96 fiscal year.

I believe they are missing a golden opportunity. But don't take the word of a career educator: Ask the CEOs of Fortune 500 companies who have weathered the stormy business upheavals of the last decade and come out on top. How did they do it? By outsmarting the competition. By reorganizing their top-heavy bureaucracies and moving decisions closer to the front lines. By investing heavily in leadership training.

This report documents the status of leadership training in the SREB states. It reveals that many states are doing a good job with the routine training that all school administrators need to carry out the daily task of managing the school enterprise. And it shows that some programs in some states are going further than that. They're getting into the real meat of leadership development—building the skills educators need to inspire improvement, manage change, and reach important goals.

But there are not enough of this kind of leadership program. And the good programs we do have don't reach enough potential leaders. Too often they are offered sporadically, without sufficient structure, and in an environment cut off from where the real action is—the classrooms, boardrooms, and offices of our community schools. Most often they're underfunded—and they're some of the first programs to feel the ax when budgets get cut.

The shift to more local decisionmaking and accountability—which we see taking place from Maryland to Texas, from Oklahoma to Florida—leaves state decisionmakers no choice. If we're going to put the future of our public schools in the hands of local school leaders, we'd better make darn sure they know how to lead.

Alton C. Crews, Director
The SREB Leadership Academy

The Public Wants Schools with Strong Leaders

By The Year 2000 –
All states and localities will have schools with improved performance and productivity demonstrated by results.

Goals for Education: Challenge 2000
Southern Regional Education Board

Today's school leaders face tough questions from a demanding public about high standards and school performance. School leaders may talk about improvement, but do they have clear goals? Do they have a vision of what schools should be, and can they communicate that vision to other educators and the community?

Do local school leaders have the knowledge, skills, influence, and perseverance to change schools for the better? Can they create schools where failure is the rare exception—not the rule for some students? Can they build the bridge between school and work and help young people prepare themselves for an increasingly diverse and competitive world?

These are questions about leadership

In its 1988 report, *Goals for Education: Challenge 2000*, the Southern Regional Education Board recognized the critical link between leadership development and school improvement. The *Goals* report described 12 ambitious education goals for the South, which—if achieved—could place the region on equal footing with the nation as a whole.

The goal-setting philosophy of *Challenge 2000* forms the basis for The SREB Leadership Academy. The Leadership Academy, established in 1990 with support from NationsBank, borrows heavily from corporate training styles. The premise behind the Academy is simple and profound: Today's volatile, high-demand education environment demands dynamic leaders who are trained *on the job* to become "agents of change" for schools.

Developing a leadership academy has taught SREB something about what must go into an effective leadership program. This report surveys the status of leadership development in the SREB states and presents a case for continued and greater commitment to development of school and district leaders who can, in an increasingly demanding environment, create schools that work for all students.

If we expect them to be accountable, we must teach them how to lead

The regional goals adopted by Southern governors and legislators in 1988 call for "schools with improved performance and productivity demonstrated by results." One way to measure progress toward this goal is to examine the extent to which states and local school systems are preparing leaders who can spark peak performance.

Most SREB states are asking local school systems to take more direct responsibility for school performance in exchange for more latitude and fewer state regulations. While local school leaders may welcome this movement as a departure from the highly regulated, top-down strategies of the 1980s, many lack the skills and knowledge they need to make the best decisions about school improvement. And the districts most in need of improvement are often the same districts with the greatest need for change-oriented leadership training.

"One of the problems with low-performing schools is they know so little about new promising practice that they can't even begin to think about what they might do differently," one state professional development director says.

Good leadership training stimulates thinking about change and gives local leaders many of the tools they need to help schools improve. And the leaders may not always be the superintendents or the principals. School board members, teachers, and other key players in our schools can also benefit from leadership development programs.

We won't have the leaders we need until we pay for leadership training

State policymakers expect local educators to guarantee school quality. In return, they need to guarantee support for ongoing leadership development.

Leadership training is probably the least expensive component of a state's education budget, given its great potential to create capacity for change and improvement. Yet what SREB noted in its 1984 report *New Directions for Improving School Leadership* is still largely true today: "Historically, very little time and money have been devoted to the professional development of school personnel—about one-tenth as much as America's corporations invest in continuing education programs."

Many SREB states established statewide leadership programs during the height of reform in the mid-1980s, but continuing support for these programs has been uneven. Several have not survived, and others have never been fully funded or have been targeted for cutbacks.

Where SREB states have built programs that help school leaders do their jobs better, most of the money has been spent on training that helps administrators manage day-to-day bureaucratic tasks. Fewer resources have been invested in training leaders to help schools, as one principal puts it, "think outside the box" of everyday routine.

What are states doing about leadership development?

Every SREB state supports programs to improve the skills of public educators—most often through state departments of education. Most states have a leadership academy or the equivalent offering management and leadership training for new or practicing administrators. Some offer training programs for teachers and for district-based management teams.

These state-supported professional development programs can be roughly divided into two categories: training with a management focus, and training with a leadership focus.

Management training may include budgeting, facility management, curriculum assessment, collective bargaining, organizational management, administrative technology, and evaluating personnel. These kinds of programs—so important to the smooth day-to-day operation of schools—are often characterized as "leadership training," but they fail to address genuine leadership issues.[1]

Successful school leaders need to know how to balance a budget, how to hire and fire personnel, how to build a strong curriculum. But this job-specific knowledge does not *make* them leaders. Good leadership training should be as pertinent to corporate presidents as it is to school principals.

Leadership training may cover decision-making, problem-solving, team-building, goal-setting, encouraging innovation, self-assessment, delegating, and conflict resolution—all aimed at developing leaders who motivate people to bring about improvements in the organization.

In the past, leadership training of this kind was seldom found outside university business schools. In fact, one professional development director says, the reason in-service programs began to provide some leadership training to educators was because "most of them did not receive (it) in their formal training preparing them for service."

How do you know good leadership training when you see it?

Good leadership training isn't hit or miss. The best training programs isolate those being trained for a period of intense study and reflection and then follow them back into the job setting where mentoring sessions and team discussions keep the issues in sharp focus.

Good leadership training tackles real-life problems and develops "visioning" and planning skills by pursuing important goals. Good leadership training helps educators connect the work they do to the larger world. It broadens their perspective and enriches their thinking.

Some states are making headway in developing leadership programs with these kinds of characteristics. Georgia offers the Governor's School Leadership Institute, a three-year program for local school leaders. Participants meet several times a year for up to seven days at a time, and they create a school improvement plan as a way to apply what they're learning to the real world.

The Kentucky Education Reform Act recognized the importance of leadership training if schools were to meet the act's ambitious goals. KERA provides funding for training on such topics as planning and implementing change, serving diverse constituencies, developing and empowering others, and resisting premature judgments. In Oklahoma and South Carolina, principals spend up to two weeks on retreats, examining leadership issues. In Oklahoma, where the leadership program is privately funded, the participants meet five times after the retreat for follow-up training.

1 John Gardner defines leadership as the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces others to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers.

Other states offer internships and apprentice programs for aspiring principals or superintendents. These programs usually provide a mentor and a curriculum that includes broad leadership training.

You won't have teamwork until you build a team

The need to prepare local leaders to make more decisions has prompted some states to offer more training in *teamwork*. These programs often include important leadership elements.

"Team training is probably the most significant piece of training that we do,' says one state training director. "And we see more changes in school district leadership out of that training than anything else we do."

Typically, state-supported team leadership programs provide training to "vertical" management teams that include teachers as well as superintendents, principals, assistant principals, school board members, and central office staff. Supporters of team training make the case that, too often, individual graduates of leadership programs return to the job full of enthusiasm but without much support from fellow educators who haven't been through a similar transforming experience. Teams share the same experiences and return to a district or school "in force," better positioned to lead change.

Tennessee's Education Improvement Act of 1992, which cuts down on state regulation and sets performance goals for local educators, spurred a merger of the state leadership academy and the teacher professional development office. The combined program will emphasize team approaches to leadership training.

In Mississippi, the Onward to Excellence program provides team-based training to a selected group of school systems and helps these schools implement what they've learned. In Georgia, the state's leadership academy is working with SREB to deliver The SREB Leadership Academy's training to 13 district-based teams. Louisiana's "Quality Schools for Louisiana program" includes 35 hours of team training and requires each team to produce a school improvement plan.

Nuts-and-bolts training is important, but it's not leadership training

While most state-run programs offer some genuine leadership training, much of their work concentrates on the nuts and bolts of accountability procedures and new state mandates.

These training sessions may be used to explain the complexities of the latest testing program or school funding formula, bring administrators up-to-date on recent legislation, or seek their advice about pending regulations. Many seminars are offered in finance, law, management, curriculum, and teacher evaluation. While such management training is essential, especially for new administrators, these programs do little to promote leadership development.

Even in those instances where state-sponsored training has a leadership focus, much of it is delivered at one-, two-, or three-day seminars that have no direct link to the schools and little follow-up support. Most of the multi-day training is offered in the summer, when leaders are not engaged in dealing with school improvement issues. As SREB noted in a 1986 report, "one-shot seminars are useful to give. . . information. However, for persons to change behaviors, activities need to include follow-up and coaching."

About half the state-run programs also require administrators to complete a specified number of training hours or credits during a given period. Unless such programs are carefully designed to build on skills over time (and they seldom are), they can become little more than a highly regulated system of "credit shopping" where those being trained have little respect for—or interest in—the courses they're required to take. To make matters worse, those who run the programs can be overwhelmed by the paperwork that goes along with approving and tracking these hours.

Corporations, colleges of business or management, and other organizations outside the education establishment frequently have highly sophisticated leadership development programs. But few state-run programs regularly take advantage of these resources. State programs are much more likely to draw on traditional education practitioners or private education training consultants to develop and deliver training.

Are state-run programs effective? Most states evaluate their leadership programs through participant surveys, and most responses are highly favorable. But very few states are doing comprehensive evaluations of the training to assess its actual impact on school improvement. One exception is South Carolina, where a full-time, in-house researcher conducts effectiveness studies of leadership training programs.

The best leadership programs build on public/private partnerships

Some states have leadership development programs that are not under the direction of the state departments of education, operated by universities, professional associations, or a combination of organizations. They often have more freedom to design and implement comprehensive leadership programs and are usually not burdened with the responsibility for routine training.

Texas, Florida, Arkansas, and North Carolina all have independent leadership programs with similar characteristics: They serve a broad constituency; they draw their expertise from many sources, and they are flexible in the way they deliver the training. They also spend more time developing broad leadership skills than do most state-run programs.

The Texas LEADership Center, operated by the Texas Association of School Administrators, serves as the state's primary research and development agency for leadership training. The center works in partnership with other associations and businesses to design leadership programs and relies on regional education service centers of the Texas Education Agency to deliver the training.

The LEADership Center has strong ties with business. Created in partnership with the E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., the center's team-oriented program builds leadership skills for all "school managers," including teachers. The five-day Du Pont program has evolved into the state's core leadership development curriculum and includes follow-up support for its graduates.

Two SREB states, Arkansas and North Carolina, have university-based leadership programs. In North Carolina, the legislature funds the 25-day residential Principals' Executive Program at UNC-Chapel Hill. The majority of the 60-plus seminar presenters are drawn from departments outside the UNC School of Education.

Arkansas' Leadership Academy relies on collaborative partnerships with the corporate sector, higher education, government, and professional associations. Each partner contributes to the development of week-long retreats for individual administrators and district teams, which must set goals and create improvement plans.

Like Texas, Arkansas has developed an extensive leadership program using a team-oriented corporate training model. The Arkansas-based Wal-Mart Corporation supplied the basic program, which has been customized for education leaders. While most Arkansas participants are from local school districts, each retreat includes representatives from universities, professional associations, and businesses, providing a mix of backgrounds and viewpoints.

Florida's Comprehensive Accountability Training Act requires leadership training for all levels of management, from teachers to superintendents. The Florida Center for Advanced Interdisciplinary Leadership Development and Renewal coordinates the development of a wide selection of leadership programs. Five regional networks, along with the state's universities, professional associations, and local districts collaborate to develop and deliver training.

Many independent organizations have strong ties with state education departments. In Texas, for example, training programs are developed by a private association, but the state agency still delivers most of the training and provides direction and guidance for its development. In Arkansas, Florida, and North Carolina, independent academies provide state agencies with resources for leadership development that otherwise might not be available.

It is likely state agencies will continue to be the best sources of routine training, including orientation programs for new administrators and workshops that keep school leaders up-to-date on rules and regulations. For in-depth training with a strong leadership focus, however, business, political, and education leaders seem to favor independent organizations who can draw on the experience and knowledge of a wide range of successful change agents—including many outside the field of education.

More states should consider the extension service model

Cultivating relationships with non-education organizations is a step that SREB states should consider as they look for ways to strengthen leadership programs. The state's flagship universities, with their large supply of intellectual resources, may offer the best opportunity to develop an interdisciplinary approach to leadership.

In Georgia, the state leadership academy works closely with the Fanning Leadership Center, located at the University of Georgia. Training programs are developed through a design team that includes representatives from the business community and university departments that are not involved in education, as well as the College of Education, local school systems, and regional education service centers.

The Fanning Center suggests a model that could be effective in other states: an independent leadership training center housed at a major state university and operating along lines similar to the federal Agricultural Extension Service, which is able to draw on the diverse resources of the university and the community as it conducts research, develops new techniques, and disseminates the most successful practices.

Leadership Development: The SREB Experience

Since 1990, when the Southern Regional Education Board began to develop and implement its Leadership Academy, SREB has gained considerable insight into the necessary components of a leadership program focused on developing leaders who can improve schools.

Underlying the SREB program is the belief that leadership skills—those common to everyone in leadership roles—can be taught. Managerial skills are not the same for superintendents, principals, and teachers, but leadership skills are universal. Another underlying belief is that traditional programs for the preparation and certification of educators fall short of providing these skills, which are necessary to deal effectively with issues such as abuse and neglect, poverty, violence, drug abuse, and increasingly hard-to-reach students.

The value of goal-setting

While many states now offer continuing education programs for school leaders, much of the training is not linked to practical application in the workplace. The SREB Leadership Academy uses goal-setting to make this connection.

The SREB experience suggests that goal-setting is an essential component of leadership development. The goals must be lofty, they must be measurable, and they must clearly contribute to the improvement of student performance.

The most successful agent for setting goals and linking training to the workplace is the *vertical leadership team*. The team, led by the superintendent, must include a cross-section of school leaders—principals, teachers, school board members—to be effective. (While several SREB states require school board training, most school boards are trained separately from school leaders, and the focus is not on leadership for change, but on basic functions, such as law and finance, or on relations with the superintendent.)

The leadership team supplies the vital link between the training environment and the real world of the school. By concentrating on important goals and meeting regularly to maintain focus on those goals, the team becomes a significant force for change.

Long-term interactive training

The SREB experience suggests that leaders learn best while on the job, tackling practical issues and pursuing clearly defined goals. One-shot leadership training activities seldom make a difference in school performance.

The SREB Leadership Academy works with five-member district teams over a four-year period, during the school year as well as in the summer, allowing teams to train while on the job. The seminars are informal, interactive workshops, encouraging a collegial relationship between participants and instructors.

Goal-setting shapes the Academy's curriculum. The training is tied directly to practical issues in the team's home district through its application to the team's specific goals.

A personal plan of improvement

Because a leader's personality and style influence the entire school atmosphere, personal introspection is an essential component of leadership development. But few state programs have a structured method to accomplish this objective. The SREB Leadership Academy's program is specifically designed to provide insight to the individual participant regarding his or her leadership style.

During an early training session, each team member's leadership style is analyzed using a nationally recognized leadership evaluation. The participant answers a self-evaluation questionnaire, which is then compared to evaluations answered by the participant's peers, superiors, and subordinates. The computer-generated results are matched against a profile of an effective leader. Each team member uses this information to develop and implement a personal plan of improvement. Participants can assess their progress when the questionnaire is administered a second time at the end of the four-year period.

A tool for reflection

When school leaders approach a decision-making situation, they generally act on the basis of their assumptions. Some assumptions that underlie leadership behavior are reliable and valid; others are biased and subjective. The Leadership Academy experience suggests that leaders who do not examine their underlying assumptions may repeat past failure.

The SREB Leadership Academy uses a *reflective learning journal* as another way to promote personal growth. Participants make weekly entries in a personal journal as part of their self-assessment. Entries focus on a situation or event, the people involved, the action taken, and the writer's reflection about the process. The journal's purpose is to prompt reflection so participants can recognize discrepancies between their intent and their actions, and they can modify their behavior and practice over time. Leaders who use the journal method consistently begin to view themselves and others more objectively and learn to communicate more clearly.

Coaching and mentoring

Mentoring is a common practice in corporate organizations—and increasingly in school classrooms. By sharing in the experience of a successful leader, a practitioner can more quickly learn the nuances and dynamics of a given environment or situation. The mentor can also serve as a sounding board for new ideas.

In the SREB leadership program, a mentor or *external peer coach* is assigned to each team. The coach is a knowledgeable, veteran education leader. He or she attends training sessions and visits the team periodically at its home site. Because the mentor is not a part of the team's school system and has no vested interest in the district's operations or politics, he or she is not threatening to the team.

The peer coach has two primary functions. The first is to track progress toward the school system's goals and offer the team ideas and technical assistance. The peer coach, who has access to each team member's leadership profile and journal entries, monitors the progress of individual improvement plans.

Collaboratives and partnerships

To be successful in restructuring, schools need to address important issues that prevent students from succeeding. Children who are hungry, homeless, or abused cannot learn in any environment—no matter how flexible or adaptive. Schools should lead the effort to coordinate the work of public and private agencies that deliver services to children, with an emphasis on early intervention. To do this, school leaders have to know how to collaborate.

Teams participating in The SREB Leadership Academy learn how to forge community-based human service collaboratives, school advisory councils, and business partnerships. To help advance this process, a business partner from the team's home community serves as a technical adviser.

Evaluation

Systematic evaluation of the impact of training programs on school improvement is vital to demonstrating that leadership development works. Scholarly studies show generally that there is a strong connection between successful schools and investment in human resources, but states must evaluate their own programs to demonstrate specific success.

Positive feedback from seminar participants does not necessarily indicate success in the classroom. "We have to tie professional development to some kind of a result," says one state professional development director. "We have to go back to the accountability for students. Do students learn? Are they improving?"

The success of the SREB project is measured in three ways. The degree to which teams achieve their education goals helps determine the project's effectiveness. Teams have five years to reach their goals. Progress toward the goals is measured each year and at the end of five years.

The extent to which individual participants strengthen their leadership behavior also is a yardstick. The leadership style assessment is conducted at the beginning and end of the four-year training period.

In addition, interviews are conducted with all participants to determine the extent to which they were influenced by the Academy's program. Peers of participants are also interviewed to determine the degree of change in the participants' leadership style.

The Challenges To Leadership Development

In many states, leadership development is not a priority. Maryland lost its Professional Development Academy in 1990. Virginia has seen professional development eliminated from the state Department of Education twice since 1991. In Louisiana, the budget for the Administrative Leadership Academy has dropped to less than half its original allocation in 1988. In Mississippi, state funding for the School Executive Management Institute has decreased to just above half its original allocation in 1982. Oklahoma also has faced funding reductions for professional development. Some states, including Oklahoma and Georgia, use registration fees for some training programs to provide additional resources.

"There is still that attitude among policymakers that leadership development is not necessary—that it's fluff or an add-on," says one state training director. "But the payoff takes time. We need some commitment to hang in there with it, but our legislators get very impatient about wanting to see change quickly."

In some states, funding for leadership training is not equally available to all schools. More often than not, less well-to-do school systems have fewer resources and a greater need for leadership development.

"Many of the districts that are knocking the top out have put money in professional development," says one state education leader. "They have put money into curriculum. They have done training at every level to make it happen. You can't expect the same results in other districts when you put in little or nothing."

Building public support

Some states are finding that their efforts to emphasize accountability and results have met with widespread misunderstanding and opposition in the community. Educators often have difficulty explaining the rationale behind reform efforts in terms that make sense to the community.

Leadership training may be the answer to this problem. Good leadership programs teach school leaders to avoid educational jargon and to respond honestly and accurately to public questions and criticism. "One of the things we teach is to always define your terms—or they will be defined for you," says one state leadership trainer.

Good leadership training also underscores the need to train principals and teachers in new techniques and practices *before* reform takes place. Parents can't be blamed for their skepticism when educators aren't able to explain what they're changing and why.

The corporate connection

The chief executive officer of a large company made this remark to one state professional development director: "We are not putting any more money into school improvement until we do something about professional development."

In general, the corporate community believes in leadership development and will work with states to improve schools through that avenue, but only if schools have the state support they need to build a basic leadership training program that emphasizes planning and teamwork.

"It sure does help when businesses say 'we believe people need to be trained to work in teams,'" one state director says.

Growing leaders takes time

Developing human resources can lead to better schools. Professional development directors report that schools emphasizing professional development are more successful, but in most cases the change is gradual.

"We already can show gains where we have had intensive professional development for primary teachers," reports one state director. "We should be expected to show that there is progressive change, but we are not going to quickly get where we've never been."

In an era of local accountability and school-level decisionmaking, a serious commitment to long-term leadership development is critical. Local educators can't be expected to improve student performance if they lack the leadership skills they need to decide what to do and how to get it done.

A State-by-State Review Of Education Leadership Programs

Alabama

Highlights:

- *Attempts are being made to customize leadership training to participants' formative evaluations according to the local schools' and school systems' professional development plans.*
- *The Office of Professional Development offers training programs for new and experienced school leaders.*
- *The Office of Professional Development coordinates training opportunities using certified trainers for the various programs.*
- *The Office of Professional Development provides a resource handbook that lists the training programs available, resource persons, professional readings, and audiovisual materials that are linked to competencies outlined in the formative evaluation program.*
- *Funding is modest, approximately $450,000, which includes state and federal (Chapter 2) funds.*

Alabama is in the midst of a court-ordered modification of the school funding process and implementation of reform legislation as passed by the state legislature. The state, however, is moving ahead with a focus on leadership development, and new and experienced administrators are among the target groups. Plans have been developed to provide training and development for the prospective administrator as well.

Leadership training is conducted through the Office of Professional Development of the Alabama State Department of Education. Formerly the LEAD Academy, the Office of Professional Development was established inside the DOE in 1993, after the expiration of federal LEAD funding.

Components of professional development that relate to new and experienced administrators are in place, and the program for prospective administrators is in the developmental stages. Training programs are available to first- and second-year principals and are being planned for new superintendents. Programs also are available to experienced principals, central office staff, and superintendents. The program for prospective administrators will target assistant principals and others certified in administration.

The content of the state's leadership training program for individuals is based on two general elements: the goals and desired improvement of local schools and school systems through a school/system improvement plan, and the results of the individuals' formative evaluations and the individual professional development plans.

Through the state's mandated personnel evaluation system, administrators are required, with assistance from an immediate supervisor, to develop individual professional development plans based on results of their evaluations. The leadership program seeks to provide training to assist administrators in meeting the specific competencies outlined in the assessment, as well as to provide additional enrichment opportunities. Recent legislation passed by the legislature requires each local school system to develop, implement, and evaluate a professional development plan based on a needs assessment.

The Office of Professional Development compiles a resource handbook that lists all training programs, dates, contacts, locations, and telephone numbers. The guide also lists suggestions for reading materials and audiovisuals for use by study groups. It also provides a list of resource persons—practicing administrators in and out of Alabama who have developed high-quality programs or who are available to share their expertise. Plans are to computerize and expand this resource.

The state's two-year program for new principals will be expanded to include summer sessions, during which the NASSP's Springfield program will be provided. Other days will be scheduled throughout the school year and will focus on training according to identified needs. First-year principals will be paired with experienced principals trained to serve as mentors and coaches. The second-year program will encourage new principals to develop a portfolio and individual growth plans, and the mentoring program will continue through the second year. Principals will also have opportunities to participate in other licensed programs, such as Leader 123, From the Desk Of..., Facilitative Leadership, and Achieving Customer Focused Schools.

The program for experienced principals involves competency and leadership training along with continued development of individual growth plans. Principals are encouraged to join a peer assistance network within their region. The network will encourage study groups and the sharing of best practices.

Programs for central office staff and superintendents will include leadership training that will involve peer assistance networks, individual assessments, and professional growth plans. Topics for workshops and seminars will be determined by identified needs.

The Office of Professional Development serves as an assistance team. Staff members coordinate various programs and provide assistance as requested. The trainer-of-trainers model is used to provide training in the various programs. A cadre of trainers is in place for each program. This allows local education practitioners, business and industry leaders, nationally known authorities, state DOE specialists, experts from other states, and college and university faculty to provide training, coaching, and networking opportunities. These authorities also serve as resources for design teams—selected professionals with expertise in program development who assist in designing programs based on local needs.

The state of Alabama and the state Department of Education provide no direct funding to local schools or school systems for professional development, but the DOE does pay participant expenses for training. Recent efforts at the state level indicate that some funds may be provided to each local system and school in the 1995-96 school year.

The 1994-95 budget for the Office of Professional Development is $257,000 from state funds and $224,000 in Chapter 2 funds.

Arkansas

Highlights:

- *The Arkansas Academy for Leadership Training and School-Based Management was created by a partnership of universities, educational cooperatives, business corporations, professional associations and government agencies, with approval of the state DOE.*
- *The academy focuses its efforts in four areas: 1) district support, 2) leadership development, 3) research, information and technology, 4) and recruitment of minority leaders.*
- *About 65 percent of the state's superintendents have completed a week-long Strategic Leadership Institute, and 300 employees of DOE have completed both team and individual institutes.*
- *DOE funding of $150,000 was matched by a similar grant from the Walton Family Foundation for DOE participation in the institute. Tyson Foods provides its modern Management Development Center for the institute, including lodging and meals.*
- *A distinguishing feature of the academy is its emphasis on the collaborative delivery of services among its 40 partners to the schools and educators.*

In Arkansas, leadership development is a collaborative effort. Universities, professional associations, corporations, educational cooperatives, and the Arkansas Department of Education work together to deliver services to schools and their leaders. This approach requires each partner to contribute to program development and implementation.

The Arkansas Academy for Leadership Training and School-Based Management provides services in four categories: district support; leadership development; research, information, and technology; and identification and recruitment of minority leaders.

The legislature established the academy in 1991 and has funded it through the state department of education. It is housed at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, which provides offices, furniture, equipment and utilities, and serves as the fiscal agent.

The academy's leadership development programs provide training for principals, superintendents, other administrators, teachers, and school board members. Also targeted are parents, business and community leaders, students, higher education faculty and deans, and government agency personnel.

Training is conducted in week-long strategic leadership institutes for teams and individuals. In the past, the training for individuals has focused on superintendents and CEOs of the academy's partner organizations, but now the focus is shifting to principals and central office administrators.

Training for individuals is conducted at the Tyson Management Development Center in Russellville, which has space for 36 people. Of those slots, 26 are reserved for the targeted group, such as superintendents or principals. Ten are for representatives of the academy's partners. These include deans of colleges of education, presidents of professional associations, state board members, and corporate executives.

The content of this training is based on the Wal-Mart Institute of Retailing but has been customized for education by the original program designers and the academy through the use of contemporary issues. For example, superintendents focus on building a school-board team of members who hold opposing views.

Other topics include building effective teams, challenging traditional processes, influencing people, impacting results, and leading leaders. As of October 1995, 65 percent of the state's superintendents had attended the institute.

In addition to individual training, team training involves seven-member groups from school districts and universities. The districts send teams who are charged with developing strategic action plans or advancing school improvement strategies.

Each team is supported by a district commitment to implement the action plan developed at the institute. Only districts whose superintendents have previously attended an institute, or whose superintendent attends with the team, may participate.

Teams from universities and from the state department of education also participate in the academy's leadership institutes. One university team used the training as part of its plan for redesigning a college of education program. The office of the governor and the state department of education sent a team to design the legislative recommendations for the state's early childhood initiative.

The objectives of team-based training encompass strengthening leadership skills, building teamwork, expanding vision, linking resources and ideas to improve planning, electronic communication, developing plans and products to achieve district and school goals in line with state and national goals, and expanding the network of leaders in Arkansas. The academy has begun using in-state trainers and continues to build that capacity for conducting the team training.

While the legislature provided baseline funding of $300,000 for the leadership academy's first three years, that funding increased to $600,000 for 1995-96. In addition, the state department of education has provided funding for special projects and program startup. Substantial support is provided by business partners. In 1994, the Walton Family Foundation provided more than $350,000. Tyson Foods, Inc. contributes use of its management development center facilities as well as room and board for participants at an estimated value of more than $20,000 per institute. Also, leadership academy partners have contributed their time, whose value is estimated at $200,000.

The academy has funded extensive independent evaluations of its programs, and evaluation results are considered in planning and developing future programs.

Florida

Highlights:

- *The Florida Council on Education Management provides leadership for selecting, designing, offering, evaluating, and conducting research on leadership development in Florida.*
- *Specific programs are selected or developed for use in Florida. Trainers and master trainers are prepared to conduct the programs.*
- *Two leadership development programs for superintendents are offered with salary incentives for participation.*
- *The legislature has annually appropriated funds for leadership and organizational development at $3.1 million over the last several years.*

Florida's Comprehensive Accountability Training Act guides the development and dissemination of an array of leadership training activities delivered through state, regional, and district-level programming. Leadership training is available to superintendents, school board members, district-level leaders, principals, and teachers.

The Florida Council on Educational Management is the core of the leadership development system. The system includes five regional Management Development Networks that deliver training and assist local districts. The Center for Leadership Development within the Department of Education complements the regional efforts by offering training programs that can best be coordinated and administered on a statewide basis.

In December 1994, the Center for Leadership Development was administratively assigned to the Florida Association of District School Superintendents, forming a collaborative partnership among the center, the Florida Department of Education, and the Florida Association of District School Superintendents.

The partnership has direct responsibility for leadership development training to school boards, superintendents, district-level leaders, school principals, and teachers. Program delivery is made possible through grants to other organizations, including the Florida School Boards' Association and the Florida Association of District School Superintendents.

At the direction of the FCEM, the partnership generates specific training programs and then cultivates statewide capacity for their delivery through a train-the-trainer model. Master trainers train, certify, and periodically re-examine program trainers. National and state leadership training experts and local practitioners lead the programs.

Specific activities offered through this partnership include the programs described below.

The Special Qualification Salary Supplement Program includes several training modules, including Core Concepts for Leadership, Using Time for What You Value, Legal Aspects of Leading a Florida School District, Economic Forces Impacting Education, Collective Bargaining, The Superintendent as Educational Leader, Leadership for Florida's Future, and other contemporary leadership issues for superintendents.

The Chief Executive Officer Leadership Development Program is a year-long program for superintendents. It involves two phases. The first focuses on continuous quality improvement, decision-making, creative leadership, goal-setting, and learning from experience. The second, a competency acquisition phase, provides learning partners who assist superintendents in applying phase one knowledge and skills.

The Superintendent Leadership Development Program is an on-going developmental program that builds on the above programs through training activities such as Executive Thinking, Challenges Facing Florida Superintendents, and Orientation for New Superintendents.

Facilitative Leadership is a three-day program aimed at educational leaders of all levels. It focuses on empowering all members of the educational team to work together to make decisions collaboratively. About 6,000 state educators have participated in this program.

Assisting Change in Education is a four-day session followed by two one-day debriefing sessions and a two- to three-day wrap-up. It is aimed at outside consultants who provide technical support for schools, including DOE staff, central office personnel, school board members, and university faculty, and focuses on trust and rapport building, organizational diagnosis, resource utilization, and capacity building.

Achieving Extraordinary Customer Relations in Education is a two-day program aimed at all educators to help them understand who their customers are and how to serve and appreciate them.

Investment in Excellence involves three full days or five half days and a two-day follow-up seminar. Through video presentations, Lou Tice of The Pacific Institute presents a program of video presentations about humans' unlimited capacity for growth, change, and creativity.

Think and Work Smarter is a two-day program introducing participants to techniques and skills that will improve their ability to organize the talents of others. It includes the introduction of thinking processes and tools to enhance the effectiveness of groups. It is aimed at district staff, school board members, administrators, teachers, and parents.

Leadership Development for Teachers is a 45-hour program for teachers who want to develop knowledge and skills relevant to school improvement. It is delivered in three components: personal assessment, changing schools, and influencing strategies.

Power Relationships for Systems Improvement, aimed at vertical teams and top management, helps participants understand power relationships and explore possibilities for new partnerships among leaders at all levels.

Total Quality Management was designed to help all school improvement stakeholders create a culture of continuous improvement.

In addition to these programs for all school leaders, the partnership oversees training for the development of principals. It approves local Human Resources Management Development programs, which each school district is required to develop and which includes extensive preparation for new principals. These programs must be based on 19 competencies for

principals developed by FCEM. The partnership also approves all education and leadership development programs offered in Florida universities.

Working directly with local systems, the Florida Association of District School Superintendents conducts organization and management reviews of local school districts at their request. The review, carried out by a team of education, leadership, and management experts, is designed to help a school district enhance its overall organization. It examines organizational processes to determine their impact on the district's mission. Similar studies on staffing and administrative compensation also are provided to districts by request. Superintendents and school boards must concur in a request for a special study.

The partnership evaluates its programs through extensive participant surveys that include written comments and scale ratings. It also contracts with independent evaluators and universities to conduct evaluations. For example, in an evaluation of facilitative leadership skills across the state, the University of Central Florida conducted hundreds of interviews and gathered testimonials.

Under the Comprehensive Accountability Training Act, the legislature approved $3.1 million in funds for statewide and regional leadership development, an amount that has remained constant as an annual appropriation during the past several years. The goal of this training support system is to implement a student-centered, results-based accountability system in every school.

Georgia

Highlights:

- *The DOE Leadership Academy develops and facilitates the delivery of a number of group dynamics, team building, and interpersonal skills training sessions to aspiring and practicing leadership personnel.*
- *The academy also manages the School Leadership Institute for the Governor's office. This program is targeted at building-level leaders and extends over a three-year period.*
- *The academy collaborates with SREB, the Fanning Leadership Center at the University of Georgia, and the state Chamber of Commerce to offer intensive training for teams of leaders from thirteen school systems.*
- *The DOE contracts with the Georgia School Boards Association and other agencies and associations to train board members.*
- *The legislature appropriated approximately $1.2 million in 1995 for these programs with about half of the budget earmarked for the Governor's School Leadership Institute. The state also supplies $30 million directly to the local systems for professional development.*

The Leadership Academy of the Georgia Department of Education houses the Georgia Education Leadership Academy, Public School Recruitment Services, Teacher Induction Services, and Staff Development Services. The academy, created through the 1986 Quality Basic Education Act, provides leadership training for aspiring and practicing superintendents, principals and central office staff, local school board members, and DOE staff.

The academy develops and delivers programs through partnerships with several internal and external groups and organizations, including professional associations, the state's 16 Regional Education Service Centers, universities, businesses, private consultants, and SREB. Through a business coalition called the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education, the academy has access to business leaders. The academy also develops some training programs in house.

As an example of one partnership, the academy works with the University of Georgia's Fanning Leadership Center, an interdisciplinary organization that has developed three training modules focusing on generic leadership skills. These are team building, effective communication, and conflict resolution.

The academy's most extensive program is the three-year Governor's School Leadership Institute, which helps school-level leaders facilitate positive school change. During their first year, participants attend a seven-day summer session as well as fall and spring sessions of two days each. During the second and third years, participants attend a two-day summer session, a fall regional meeting, and a spring session. Participants must submit change projects, and they receive grants to assist in implementation.

Program topics include mission and goals for the 21st century, inventing schools for the 21st century, organizational behavior, effecting change, environmental scanning, decision making, executive thinking, leadership in groups, performance development, linkages to business and parent partnerships, and goal setting.

Participants' leadership styles are assessed by themselves as well as by peers, subordinates, and supervisors. They participate in computer simulations of school problems, experiential modules, large- and small-group exercises, and networking. They also participate in cultural enrichment activities such as museum and theater visits.

Governor's School participants may also take part in other programs offered through the RESAs. These programs are titled Leadership and Teamwork, which assists school improvement teams in working together; Colleagues for School Success, which provides technical on-site assistance in implementing school-improvement plans; and Site-Based Leadership, which provides on-site assistance in implementing site-based management.

Also offered through the academy is the Superintendent Professional Development Program, a collaborative effort with the Georgia School Superintendents Association, the Georgia School Boards Association, the University of Georgia, Georgia State University, and business leaders of BellSouth Corp., Coca-Cola Co., and IBM Corp. The two-year program is available to administrators who aspire to become superintendents. Since Georgia is in the process of

moving from electing to appointing superintendents, the program includes a component to assist school boards in selecting superintendents.

The aspiring superintendent training is offered in a two-tiered program. The first tier focuses on practical administration of school systems, including facilities, finance, law, curriculum development, technology, and human resources. The second focuses on leadership development, including change management, individual and group dynamics, and governance.

The program includes a newly developed assessment center designed by the American Association of School Administrators and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Each participant develops a professional development plan based on assessment. They also conduct action research projects and are paired with practicing superintendents.

In cooperation with the state superintendents association, New Superintendents' Orientation is periodically conducted. Topics include relations with the school board, relations with the state board and education department, law, personnel, curriculum, the media, the community, and emerging trends. Regional follow-up training is available on request.

The leadership academy also offers a New Leaders Institute for entry-level administrators whose curriculum is based on the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument and the skill areas addressed in the principal assessment center programs. Participants meet for nine days during one year. For experienced administrators, the academy offers Education's Leadership Georgia, a year-long program based on the Excellent Principal Inventory program. Topics include visioning, 21st century schools, power and politics, building public support, and strategic leadership. The Assistant Principal Development Program offers assessment and skill development for assistant principals and lead teachers. Principals and other educators deliver this training.

In cooperation with SREB, the academy sponsors the Next Generation School Project, which involves 13 school leadership teams who participate in SREB's Leadership Academy.

The academy also offers the NASSP Assessment Center through the Georgia State University Principals' Center and at several satellite locations. Other NASSP leadership programs, including Let's Talk, From the Desk Of..., and Leader 123, are offered upon request.

The academy is required by law to provide training to school board members in association with the Georgia School Boards Association and other agencies and associations. Training includes a one-day orientation for new members, and one day of training per year for veteran members.

The academy is funded through registration fees, in-kind contributions from private organizations and local school systems, and state funds. The academy budget for fiscal year 1995 was $1.2 million. In 1994, the budget was just over $1 million. For 1993, the budget was $600,000. For 1992, $287,000, and for 1991, $563,499. Almost half the current budget is designated for the Governor's School Leadership Institute.

The academy evaluates programs through participant feedback and is in the process of conducting an effectiveness study of the Governor's School Leadership Institute, with the goal of measuring the program's impact on school change.

Georgia also provides $30 million directly to local school systems for professional development. The state's Quality Basic Education Act requires local school systems to submit a plan for comprehensive staff development activities for local educators. Local systems may provide staff development opportunities or fund a professional development stipend for college courses or other acceptable credit-bearing activities.

Kentucky

Highlights:

- *The Kentucky Education Reform Act includes one of the most sweeping professional development mandates in the nation.*
- *All local districts are required to develop a comprehensive plan for training their leadership personnel. All superintendents are required to engage in a personal growth plan approved by DOE's Division of Professional Development.*
- *DPD certifies trainers, approves training programs, and publishes a directory of programs.*
- *All programs must support KERA goals and superintendents are trained and tested in five areas: 1) school law, 2) school finance, 3) school management, 4) school-based decision-making, and 5) school curriculum.*

The Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 increased requirements and set in motion new plans for professional development in the state. The plans are based on the legislation's goals of greater accountability for improved school performance and student achievement.

In an effort to align professional development experiences with the needs and goals of local districts, Kentucky requires each local district and school to write an Annual Professional Development Plan, which must be approved by the Kentucky Department of Education. The Division of Professional Development coordinates a peer review process to approve these plans.

For 1995, the state allocated $11.6 million to generate professional development plans at the local and state levels. Funding for 1996 is set at $14.5 million. In 1995, $18 per pupil will flow directly to localities for professional development. In 1996, $23 per pupil will be allocated to localities. The state will keep $2 per pupil each year for development of statewide programming. This total allocation has grown from $4 million per year in the 1990-92 biennium and $10 million in 1992-94. Of the funds allocated to districts, a minimum of 65 percent must be provided to school-based councils. The actual dollar amounts are determined by average daily attendance in the schools.

Schools that develop and implement their plans receive assistance and support, are assured training based on individual school needs, and are eligible to participate in district, regional, and state training programs. Local districts or groups of districts may also set up their own leadership development programs. Schools are urged to use a variety of models that include action-based research, guided observation and feedback, study teams, and teacher networks.

In an effort to enable small districts to pool resources, Kentucky also requires that school districts with less than 20,000 students belong to professional development consortia, made up of two or more districts. This statutory requirement expires in June 1995, but districts may elect to continue these relationships.

Kentucky's Effective Instructional Leadership Act, enacted in 1984, requires administrators to receive 42 clock hours of training every two years. Those covered under the law are principals, assistant principals, instructional supervisors, directors of special education, and guidance counselors. Educators who do not complete the requirements are placed on one-year probation. If the requirements are not met, the state may revoke certification.

While it provides little training directly, the Division of Professional Development approves all training and providers of training in Kentucky. The division offers technical assistance, support, and guidance in determining the types of training offered around the state.

Training is provided by professional organizations, private training organizations, universities, other government agencies, and local school districts. In 1994, the division approved 1,500 training programs. One provider may offer as many as 15 to 20 programs. The division publishes a listing of programs, including the name, content, provider, and cost of each program. Organizations or districts wishing to offer training programs must submit proposals to the Division of Professional Development for approval.

Program content must support KERA goals. Specific leadership skills that should be included in the training content are encouraging innovation, planning and implementing change, serving diverse constituencies, acquiring and interpreting relevant information, resisting premature judgments, resolving complex problems, communicating expectations, developing and empowering others, balancing complex demands, and understanding personal strengths. Training should also include management competencies, such as planning, directing, and accounting. Training in law, curriculum assessment, and personnel evaluation also is expected.

Superintendents in Kentucky are required to be trained and tested in five areas: school law, school finance, school management, school curriculum, and school-based decision-making. They must pass a comprehensive test to be eligible for continued employment, a requirement established by KERA.

A program curriculum, written with the advice of attorneys, superintendents, university professors, and other expert consultants, was completed in 1994. This curriculum was then field-tested and revised by a private training organization. Superintendents and university

personnel now deliver the training to the superintendents. Universities coordinate the program under an agreement with the Kentucky Department of Education.

The comprehensive test includes two multiple-choice tests in law and finance. Tests in management, school-based decision-making, and curriculum assessment require written answers based on scenarios. A team of readers judges these answers.

Superintendent assessment is also required by KERA legislation. The National Association of Secondary School Principals and the American Association of School Administrators developed a program for Kentucky based on the NASSP's Principal Assessment Center and on research about superintendent job responsibilities. Superintendents receive confidential feedback that serves as the basis for a personal development plan. Superintendents who do not complete the training, testing, and assessment lose their eligibility for employment. They must also meet a continuing education requirement of 21 clock hours per year toward an individual growth plan or of participation in the effective leader programs.

KERA also requires principals to be assessed, using a NASSP-like assessment program. All principals must complete the assessment within one year of employment to be eligible to continue. Principals, like superintendents, develop individual plans that guide their choices of training activities.

State funds are appropriated at $800,000 for each year of the 1994-96 biennium for testing, training, and assessment of superintendents and principals.

The Kentucky Department of Education has developed a long-term program of leadership development for principals, which includes recruitment and induction programs as well as continuing education. By January 1997, the state also plans to link university preparation programs for administrators with assessment and continuing education training.

Louisiana

Highlights:

- *The Department of Education manages the Administrative Leadership Academy with 3,500 local school members. Members are required to earn 15 ALA credits every five years.*
- *ALA establishes content guidelines in three categories: 1) leadership and management, 2) instructional supervision, and 3) organizational administration.*
- *More than 40 school teams have enrolled in a continuous quality improvement program offered by the ALA staff.*
- *ALA, in conjunction with Southeastern Louisiana University, offers a two-year internship program for new principals, and a one-year program for assistant principals.*
- *ALA is funded in 1995-96 with state appropriations of $300,000 for the principal and assistant principal programs and $100,000 for the academy, and $125,700 in federal funds.*

In Louisiana, the Administrative Leadership Academy guides the continuing education activities of administrators under the authority of the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. Superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and central office administrators who supervise instructional programs or personnel are members of the academy and are required to earn 15 ALA credits every five years. Each credit earned requires 10 hours of instruction. No credit is awarded for being a training provider.

The role of the ALA is to assess needs, create programs and budgets, and develop and implement workshops, courses, and activities. The academy staff provides some training directly, but it also approves programs provided by sponsoring organizations and requests by individual administrators to receive academy credit for attending conferences or training programs. The academy is also responsible for monitoring renewal credits acquired by its 3,500 members.

To perform its tasks, the academy has established content guidelines that all approved training programs must address. They are divided into three categories:

Leadership and management programs including such topics as vision, goal-setting, time management, resource management, delegating, problem-solving, decision-making, motivation, leadership styles and characteristics, and communication.

Instructional administration training focusing on development; implementation and evaluation of curricula; supervision, development and evaluation of staff performance; student performance; student services; and parent-community involvement.

Organizational administration activities emphasizing physical environment, school climate, development of community support, fiscal management, technology, policy implementation, and collective bargaining.

State law requires that training be available on both regional and statewide bases. Administrators may earn academy credit through approved programs offered by local school districts, private or professional organizations, the state Department of Education or other state agencies. Participants can receive the most academy credits for participation in a self-contained, single-theme training session—a minimum of one-half credit to a maximum of five. Special approval is required for more than five credits. A conference involving concurrent sessions on different topics can be approved for a maximum of one credit. Administrators also may earn three academy credits for one college course taken during the five-year renewal period.

Recently, the state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education allocated $2 million for a new professional development program to train in new and innovative teaching methods and management skills. Proposals may come from local districts (public or private), colleges or universities, or the State Department of Education.

The most extensive academy-sponsored program is the Louisiana Principal Internship Program, required by the state board. The two-year program for new principals provides 30 hours of training each year. Participants receive three academy credits. The curriculum is

based on *Principals for Our Changing Schools: Knowledge and Skill Base* from the National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

The Principal Internship Program includes statewide meetings, area meetings, and on-site visits. The content of the area meetings is based on local needs. Participants must assemble portfolios indicating successful completion. University professors and local practitioners conduct the field training. Southeastern Louisiana University, under contract with the Department of Education, coordinates the program. Funding for the program comes from the state board, with additional funding from private sources.

The state board also requires newly appointed assistant principals to participate in a one-year, 30-hour internship that consists of regional training sessions provided through the Department of Education Regional Service Centers. The content of the training is based on survey information received. Assistant principals who are promoted to principal participate in the principal internship.

Another program sponsored by the academy is Quality Schools for Louisiana, delivered by academy staff and the Effective Schools Bureau staff. This program provides training in Continuous Quality Improvement for school-based teams at three levels. Level I consists of five hours of CQI awareness training. Level II encompasses six five-hour sessions of basic training for a total of 30 hours. Level III requires 10 hours of "continuous" training based on the teams' needs.

Teams that complete awareness training and want to commit to participation in the basic training must work on school-improvement projects. The Quality Schools program is voluntary and has been undertaken by more than 40 school teams, each consisting of the district superintendent, two central office supervisors, one school board member, the school principal, three teachers, and two students. This program is funded through a federal Title II grant.

Other programs sponsored through the academy are the NASSP's Leader 123 and Springfield programs. In 1995-96, the academy is discontinuing the NASSP's Assessment Center program due to lack of staff and funding, but it will probably be offered again in the future. Trainers, facilitators, coaches, and mentors for NASSP programs are local district personnel (available on a limited basis) and academy staff.

In an effort to stretch resources, the academy staff has recruited other state education department personnel to provide additional training for academy members. These programs include Total Quality Management/Continuous Quality Improvement; 4MAT, an instructional and organizational model focusing on personal learning styles; discussions of Steven Covey's *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*; Strengthening Local Evaluation; and Leadership for Change.

The academy is periodically evaluated by an independent consultant contracted by the State Board of Education. Individual programs are evaluated by participants through surveys, and results are summarized and provided to sponsoring organizations.

Funding for the Administrative Leadership Academy comes from the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. For fiscal year 1993-94, the board allocated $300,000 for the academy. An additional $150,000 in federal funds was received for the Quality Schools Program. During fiscal year 1994-95, the allocation for the academy was $300,000 (from the board) and $125,747 (from Title II) for the Quality Schools Program.

Fiscal year 1995-96 funding includes $300,000 for the Principal and Assistant Principal Internship programs; $100,000 for the Administrative Leadership Academy; and $125,700 for the Quality Schools for Louisiana program.

Maryland

Highlights:

- *During fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995, the Staff Development Branch of the DOE coordinated a school improvement leadership training program targeted at local schools that were in the bottom 10 percent of Maryland's performance rankings. About 150 of the state's 1,280 local schools qualified for this training.*
- *The program content focused on assisting school improvement teams in the development of improvement plans, interpretation and use of student performance data, benchmarking, and a 10-step process for school improvement.*
- *By the end of fiscal year 1995, more than 700 local educators had participated in the training.*
- *The state's performance standards provide procedures for the State Board of Education to intervene in schools that are failing to make sustained and substantive progress toward the satisfactory standards.*
- *During fiscal years 1994 and 1995, the base budget for the school improvement leadership training was $90,000. An additional $20,000 in federal Chapter 1 funds were dedicated to this program each year. Most of the funds were consumed by paying for substitutes for teachers leaving their classrooms and for stipends for teachers attending summer training.*
- *Beginning in fiscal year 1995, and extending into fiscal year 1996, the approach of the DOE shifted from direct delivery of school improvement leadership training to a capacity-building approach. Technical Assistance/Support Teams have been identified by 22 of 24 local school systems. The DOE has provided training similar in content to the school improvement leadership training. These teams are expected to provide the on-site training and assistance needed by the low performing schools.*

Low-performing schools have been the target for state-sponsored leadership training in Maryland. During fiscal year 1994-1995, the role of the state DOE was to deliver the training directly to school improvement teams. Schools in or near the bottom 10 percent of Maryland's performance rankings were eligible for the state-sponsored School Improvement Leadership

Training. Beginning in fiscal year 1995, the role of the state DOE has been to help develop the capacity of local school system personnel to provide the support for low-performing schools, through the establishment of Technical Assistance/Support Teams.

The Maryland State Department of Education's Staff Development Branch coordinates the program. Trainers come from four divisions within the department and from two local school systems. One local college faculty member also helps with the training. The program began in October 1993. Prior to that, Maryland had no state-sponsored leadership training available since the abolishment of its professional development academy in 1990.

Eligible schools are Title I schools that are in program improvement, and schools receiving state funds for improvement through the state's Challenge Schools program. Approximately 150 of Maryland's 1,280 schools participated in the state-sponsored school improvement leadership training. This direct training was provided to principals, school improvement teams, and central office personnel who directly served those schools. It is expected that more schools will benefit from the local Technical Assistance/Support Teams.

The leadership training content has focused on preparing teams to produce school improvement plans that reflect the specific needs of the school and that include viable long-term solutions to school problems. A major goal of the program has been to train administrators and school improvement teams to read and interpret state performance data to guide planning. School improvement plans are reviewed as part of the process of approving school requests for state funding. The state DOE is currently involved in developing a standardized process for reviewing school improvement plans. Beginning Jan. 1, 1996, all school improvement plans reviewed by the state DOE will be expected to meet the requirements of this standardized process. This process will allow local schools and systems to submit a single school improvement plan for multiple funding uses.

The training program content encompasses the following: Maryland's 10-step process for school improvement, facilitative leadership, understanding and using data, the need for staff development to support school improvement, tools for monitoring and evaluating progress, and effective programs and practices. Topics also include team-building, the change process, recent instructional research, effective administration, problem-solving and evaluation, and benchmarking for continuous improvement. Maryland has certified 23 trainers in facilitative leadership.

By August 1995, the department had delivered entry-level training and team training to more than 700 educators, with a result of markedly improved school improvement plans. Those who completed the training, however, requested continued support for successful implementation of their plans. It is expected that this need will be met by the local Technical Assistance/Support Teams.

Maryland's focus on low-performing schools is based on the state's accountability program—the Maryland School Performance Program—established in 1990. Under this program, local schools that do not make sustained and significant progress toward satisfactory standards are subject to state reconstitution. Performance reports are published annually and made available to the public.

During fiscal years 1994 and 1995, the base budget for the school improvement leadership training was $90,000 of designated federal Chapter 2 funds. An additional $20,000 in federal Chapter 1 funds were dedicated each year to this program. Most of the funds were consumed by paying for substitutes for teachers leaving their classrooms and for teachers' stipends who attended the summer training. Training has been provided by state staff who also have other program responsibilities.

Currently, the program is being evaluated using the first two levels of the Kirkpartick four-level evaluation scale. These two levels measure reactions to the training program and whether the participants have gained knowledge through the training. Because improvement in the quality of the school improvement plans has been noted, it is expected that the training will be one of a number of factors contributing to improved school performance in the future.

Mississippi

Highlights:

- *The DOE directs the School Executive Management Institute that provides training for local administrators and board members. Participation is required by statute.*
- *SEMI offers programs at three levels: 1) entry-level training, 2) career-level training, and 3) auxiliary special sessions providing conferences to keep leaders abreast of current issues.*
- *SEMI's programs are conducted regionally and by districts. Presenters include DOE staff, current and former administrators, former board members, and university personnel.*
- *Superintendents must complete orientation training before completing their first year in office. They must also complete 50 hours of training every five years. New board members must receive 12 clock hours of training their first six months in office and six additional hours each year thereafter.*
- *SEMI was created in the early 1980s with an initial allocation of $850,000; however, its appropriation dropped to 595,000 in 1996.*

In Mississippi, the state Department of Education, through the Office of Leadership Development and Enhancement, directs the School Executive Management Institute, which provides intensive training to all school administrators, including superintendents and local school board members. Participation in the institute is required by law.

The institute's training programs are conducted regionally and by district. School districts or groups of districts can request specific training programs. Most institute training modules are developed by contractors employed by the state's Office of Leadership Development and Enhancement and are delivered by practitioners trained by the developers.

Three programs constitute the institute: entry-level training, career-level training, and auxiliary programs. The entry-level instruction comprises an orientation to primary roles, responsibilities, and skills. Career-level training develops conceptual, technical, and human relations skills. Auxiliary programs refer to special sessions such as conferences devised to keep administrators up to date on current issues.

New school board members must receive 12 hours of entry-level training and six additional hours of training each succeeding year. New school administrators must participate in a two-year entry-level training program. They earn 50 contact hours of training during each subsequent five-year period.

The entry-level training for school board members is conducted over a two-day period. Topics include the policy-making role of the local board, the relationship of the board with the superintendent, the difference between private citizen and public servant, leadership, accreditation, financial management, human relations, crisis management, personnel, staff development, and a state code overview. Maximum enrollment is 40. Superintendents may also attend.

Two facilitators lead the training along with expert presenters, who include Department of Education staff, current or former school board members, attorneys, superintendents, principals, media professionals, and Mississippi School Board Association representatives.

Career training for school board members consists of the Continuing Education Course for School Board Members on topics such as the role of the local board, leadership, financial management, school restructuring, innovations in school management, human relations, multicultural and multiethnic relations, and crisis management.

During their first year in the entry-level program, local school administrators are provided an in-depth orientation, focusing on leadership skills, the application of effective school research in improved performance, supervision and evaluation, staff development, and curriculum and instruction. These administrators must also become certified evaluators through the Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument, and successfully complete the NASSP Assessment Center and the portfolio of the Mississippi Administrator Assessment Instrument.

New superintendent orientation includes certification on the Mississippi Administrator Assessment Instrument; training in leadership and management skills such as leadership styles, effective communication, human relations, public relations, and crisis management; and training in program and operational procedures, including budgeting, financial management, school law, legal requirements, and school improvement. Superintendents may complete the training through programs offered or approved by the School Executive Management Institute. Superintendents attend an orientation training before completing their first year in office and earn 50 contact hours of training every five years.

Career-level training for administrators duplicates that of superintendents. All must earn 50 contact hours every five years. The training requirement may be met through programs offered or approved by the institute. Options include School Improvement Through Staff Development, Developmental Instructional Programs K-3, Computer Applications for School

Administrators, Leader 123, Leadership in Educational Television and Related Technology, Thinking Like a Leader, and several other programs. Modules are also offered in conflict resolution, team building, decision making by consensus, and facilitation.

The institute offers advanced training programs to administrators on a competitive basis. These include the Advanced Leadership Development Program, an intensive two-year program; assessor training; training of trainers for new programs; and mentorship projects. Career training requirements may be met through programs offered outside the institute, such as business-industry training, training offered by professional organizations, university programs, and out-of-state leadership programs.

The institute's auxiliary programs provide updates on new legislation, state Department of Education requirements, and other current issues in meetings throughout the year. Practicing administrators should attend one each year. Superintendents are required to attend updates or conferences called by the State Superintendent of Education.

The institute also offers programs, such as Onward to Excellence, that are privately developed and funded. This program emphasizes development of vertical school leadership teams to set goals for improvement. The Office of Leadership Development and Enhancement received private funding to offer this nationally recognized program in a third of its 149 districts.

Participant evaluations are conducted for all programs during and after the training. Written and telephone surveys are also conducted.

The Mississippi legislature created the School Executive Management Institute in 1982 with an $850,000 allocation. By 1992, that amount dropped to $182,000. For 1995, the funding was $466,000. For 1996, funding is set at $595,000. In addition, the 1994 legislature appropriated $112,000 specifically for school board training and $150,000 for specifically for implementing the assessment process for school administrators.

North Carolina

Highlights:

- *Leadership training is delivered in North Carolina by a mix of agencies: universities, independent providers at the University of North Carolina, businesses, and the state department.*
- *Eight regional universities develop and deliver programs based on needs in their areas. Each university program receives an annual appropriation of $150,000.*
- *The Principals' Executive Program is a well-established and proven program located at UNC Chapel Hill. Some 2,083 school administrators (principals, assistant principals, superintendents, and central office staff) have completed the program since 1984. The legislature provided $1.2 million to underwrite the program in 1994.*

- ***The state Department of Public Instruction has partnerships with businesses that open corporate training to school leaders.***

In 1995, North Carolina reorganized its state Department of Public Instruction, and several state-run leadership programs were eliminated. Programs are still offered through universities, however, and some local districts fund their own leadership training. Programs range from technical assistance to a residential leadership academy.

State educators and administrators must participate in training programs to renew their licenses. Renewal regulations specify that 15 renewal credits must be completed during a five-year license renewal cycle. One renewal credit is equal to 10 contact hours of course work. Educators can earn one unit of renewal credit for each year of experience. Credits can be earned through workshops, college courses, or other training.

In 1993, the North Carolina General Assembly enacted several pieces of legislation affecting the preparation, licensure, and ongoing professional development of school administrators. The number of university preparation programs was reduced by means of a competitive process from 12 to eight. A scholarship program was established to recruit promising administrative candidates into full-time programs of graduate study. An independent professional board was established to set standards for school administration and to administer a new licensure exam for prospective principals and superintendents. The 1993 session of the General Assembly also abolished administrative tenure.

The state legislature funds educational consortia at eight universities providing leadership development for local school districts. Each university develops programs based on the needs in its area. The programs are located at East Carolina University, the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Appalachian State University, Western Carolina University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and North Carolina Central University.

Each program is funded at $150,000 a year. In addition, local school systems pay a participation fee for some activities. The programs provide a range of services, including research services, lending libraries, and conferences. Program topics range from Discipline with Dignity to discussions of Steven Covey's *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* to grant writing.

The Principals' Executive Program is an intensive residential leadership development program housed at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Funded directly by the legislature at $1.2 million in 1994, it is a 25-day residential program scheduled over a four-month period.

The PEP holds nine sessions per year—five for principals and superintendents and four for assistant principals, enrolling up to 40 people per session. Central office staff may also participate in some programs. Most of the presenters are university faculty, and most represent departments other than the School of Education. Sessions include 62 to 65 presenters per session.

The PEP curriculum includes in-depth reading and writing assignments as well as seminars, lectures, self-assessment tests, stress tests, cultural activities, and discussions. Session topics explore strategic planning, ethics, managing change, communications, and legal issues. All participants must plan and implement school improvement projects. Between September 1984 and December 1995, 2,083 participants completed the program, and 1,792 are still active administrators.

The Center for Creative Leadership, an international non-profit leadership organization located in Greensboro, has been an important consultant and subcontractor to this program.

Legislation was recently passed to establish a separate facility for PEP and other administrator training programs. A bill to appropriate $9.9 million for the facility was approved for the 1996-97 fiscal year. In addition, the legislation created a leadership academy to offer ongoing professional development for practicing administrators, but the specific program and management structure has yet to be designed. It has not been determined whether PEP and its programs will be a part of the leadership academy or if the leadership academy will offer separate programs.

Leadership programs at the State Department of Public Instruction have been reduced, but as of December 1995, the department was continuing to sponsor a business-industry liaison program. This program has provided corporate management training through 12 businesses that open their programs to practicing administrators. These administrators attend along with the corporations' management personnel.

Seminar topics have included negotiation, problem-solving, participatory management, facilitative leadership, and team building, among others. One- to five-day seminars have been offered at various times of the year and in various locations; the state has published a seminar schedule. Each corporation has paid the administrator's registration, tuition, and materials costs. Participants have been required to complete evaluations and action plans to receive credit.

Individual school systems also offer professional development activities. Some have their own locally-funded leadership academies and programs for future leaders and central office staff.

Oklahoma

Highlights:

- *Oklahoma's Principals' Leadership Academy, formed in 1994, provides generic leadership training based on corporate modules. Participants spend 15 days annually in the program operated jointly by the State Department of Education and Northeastern State University.*
- *The principals' academy presenters are professional trainers not associated with the SDE. Topics include a discussion of Steven Covey's* **Seven Habits of Highly Effective People**, *an outdoor team-building exercise, time management, and leadership versus authority.*

- ***Oklahoma requires all school districts to submit a four-year professional development plan that is updated annually. Funds for local professional development are allotted on the basis of student population.***

- ***Mandated training for first-time superintendents is conducted by the SDE and requires 11 days annually. The program content focuses on technical management skills. Training is also required for first-time school board members and principals.***

The Principals' Leadership Academy was new to Oklahoma in 1994. Developed from the experience of corporate management training, the academy was established through a partnership of the State Department of Education and Northeastern State University and is privately funded.

Principals spend 10 days in a university residential setting participating in team-building activities such as a ropes course and seminars. Topics include a discussion of Steven Covey's *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, time management, communication styles, creating synergy, leading productive meetings, making group decisions, dealing with confrontations, managing change, visioning, and leadership versus authority.

The training is focused on leadership skills that are not specific to education, but the facilitator demonstrates how the skills apply to situations facing education leaders. The facilitator is a professional trainer not associated with the SDE.

After this session, participants meet five more times in historic locations throughout the state. Currently, the academy is limited to 30 participants per session, but the state plans to expand the program.

In 1995, Oklahoma's annual three-day summer conference for all administrators, superintendents, principals, and central office leaders was titled Oklahoma's Best. It was conducted by the SDE. Participation is voluntary, and 1,500 people attended in 1995.

In the past, topics have emphasized broad leadership issues, such as motivation and communication. At the request of participants, the 1995 conference focused specifically on education-specific management subjects. Topics included updates on accreditation and deregulation, alternative education, special education, telecommunications, new legislation, finance, school violence, school law, the Oklahoma cost accounting system, core curriculum, student assessment, Title I, and Troops to Teachers, a program that allows former military personnel to become certified as teachers.

Oklahoma also requires that first-time Oklahoma superintendents—a class of 45-50 educators—attend 11 days of training by the state education department to meet certification qualifications. This program requires attendance at a State Board of Education meeting, attendance at the three-day summer conference for superintendents, and eight days of professional development training seminars conducted throughout the year by the state department of education.

This program emphasizes laws and requirements specific to Oklahoma. Superintendents may choose from topics including relationships between superintendents and boards of education, legal issues, staff relationships, school finance, plant management and school facilities, and setting school district or site goals.

Additional training is mandated for all first-time administrators who conduct personnel evaluations of teachers and administrators. They must participate in two days of training on the state criteria for evaluations. The training is based on effective schools research and teaching. Because all beginning principals attend this program, experienced practitioners also provide additional training in leadership skills.

Oklahoma requires first-time school board members to participate in two days of SDE training. Thereafter, members must take 15 hours of continuing education, which they fulfill through state-approved programs.

Oklahoma requires formal professional development committees in all districts to submit four-year professional development plans and to update them annually. Money for professional development is allocated based on the size of the student population. As part of the professional development plan, teachers and administrators are required to complete periodic training in outreach to parents and multicultural education.

All teachers and administrators must obtain 75 professional development points in a five-year cycle. One hour equals one point of training. A semester hour of college credit equals 15 points.

The Professional Services Division of the Oklahoma State Department of Education serves as the primary developer and planner of educational programs. While its staff delivers some of the training, budget and staff reductions in recent years have created a need for outside presenters. They are experienced practitioners trained by the state department. The state also contracts with professional leadership trainers, some business leaders, and some out-of-state education professionals.

The state monitors the training while it is being delivered and conducts an evaluation of trainers to maintain the quality of program content and delivery. Program evaluation is conducted through participant surveys.

State funding for professional development in 1995 was allocated as follows: $6,590 for the Criteria for Effective Evaluation Training; $7,700 for the First-Year Superintendents' Training; $696,192 for the state's professional development centers; and nearly $1.1 million directly to school districts.

South Carolina

Highlights:

- *The 1984 Educational Improvement Act created the Office of Professional Development, which oversees the Leadership Academy and the School and District Assistance Brokering Section.*
- *Principals receive training in NASSP's Springfield and LEADER 123 programs.*
- *A database and catalog contain training programs offered by the DOE, professional associations, universities, and the corporate sector.*
- *Approximately $1.5 million in federal and state funds support these programs. The state provides $2.5 million for teacher staff development.*

South Carolina's Leadership Academy was created in 1981, but the state's 1984 Education Improvement Act significantly increased requirements for and commitment to professional development. The Office of Professional Development oversees a variety of programs divided into two components: the South Carolina Leadership Academy and the School and District Assistance Brokering Section.

The Leadership Academy houses the New Principals' Academy, which begins with a week-long summer institute. New principals are paired with experienced colleagues who serve as mentors throughout the year. Resource and idea sharing are the focus; experienced principals lead workshops, provide school management checklists, and describe examples of successful activities. Academy topics include school climate, effective public relations, leadership styles, supervising instruction, survival skills, and achieving consensus. Funding is $18,000.

The Internship for Principals enables two to four principals to spend a year as interns in the Office of Professional Development. The interns design, implement, and evaluate staff development programs; identify and develop resources to aid principals; coordinate specific programs; work with other state and national agencies; and assess principals' developmental needs. The state pays salary, benefits, and travel at a cost of $165,000 for two interns.

The Superintendent Development Institute is a year-long program for superintendents and assistant superintendents that allows them to work closely with a mentor. Acceptance decisions are based on interviews, using the kind of questions that superintendents face in job interviews with school boards. Eight events are held each year and include panel discussions with experienced superintendents. Self-assessment is emphasized. The state spends $22,000 per year on the program.

The Principal Assessment Center, a National Association of Secondary School Principals program, is used to meet a state requirement that principals undergo intensive assessment of leadership and management skills. It is state funded at $147,000.

Other leadership programs offered through the South Carolina Leadership Academy include the NASSP's Springfield Skill Development for School Leaders. It is state funded at

$12,000. The Leader 123 program of the NASSP is funded at $10,000. South Carolina also provides $2.4 million directly to localities for teacher development.

The District Assistance Brokering Section serves as the primary contact point for staff development. It provides referral and resource information, reviews school data to determine professional development needs, and evaluates professional development programs. Services are provided through six regionally based education associates.

Under the brokering section, the Office of Professional Development combined a $200,000 federal grant for Effective Schools training with a $50,000 state program for Quality Seminars. Schools identified under the federal Chapter Two legislation as meeting the criteria for Effective Schools training receive extensive consultant assistance. Teams from those schools are then invited to participate first in quality awareness seminars and later in two- or three-day seminars on a variety of topics.

The state's Office of Professional Development serves as an umbrella organization, coordinating the training programs of various groups. This coordination has reduced some duplication of efforts and allowed the sharing of expenses for trainers. The brokering section publishes a database and catalog listing all programs, seminars, institutes, and other training opportunities offered by the state, colleges, and professional associations.

A full-time researcher in the Office of Professional Development evaluates training programs. This staff member conducts research on the impact and success of training on school performance. New models are developed from the results.

Tennessee

Highlights:

- *The Education Improvement Act of 1992 abolished many state policies and regulations and placed greater accountability upon local leaders to set goals and report results.*
- *Tennessee's Executive Development Program for Public School Leaders directs training for superintendents. About 98 percent of superintendents have participated in these programs. Successful completion of the Chief Education Officer Leadership Institute provides a $1,000 annual salary supplement for superintendents.*
- *Tennessee has developed a commendable strategy for linking leadership training to a state master plan. The plan drives leadership training.*
- *The DOE and the state school boards association have developed a competency-based assessment process for board members.*
- *The annual budget for leadership training is $2.9 million.*

The Tennessee Institute for Excellence in Education administers the State Department of Education's leadership development programs for teachers, administrators, superintendents, and school board members. It provides a variety of leadership training opportunities through

the Tennessee Executive Development Program for Public School Leaders, the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders, the School Board Training Academy, and the Teacher Leadership Development Programs.

Tennessee provides extensive training for superintendents through the Tennessee Executive Development Program for Public School Leaders. An advisory board of superintendents, business and industry representatives, higher education representatives, and professional association representatives provides comments on program content for the state board of education and the commissioner of education. Though the program is optional, approximately 98 percent of all superintendents participate.

The first component of the program, Professional Development Fellowships, allows superintendents to apply for grants for self-directed study. Participants must maintain a journal of activities and complete mid-point and final reports. At least 15 days must be devoted to the investigation, and participants present results to educators across the state and make policy recommendations to the state.

The second component, School System Improvement Projects, allows superintendents to apply for grants for self-directed projects to improve instructional leadership, teamwork, or school climate. Participants continue to keep journals, and make them available for periodic review. Mid-point and final reports are required. Acceptable projects may include planning a staff development program or community- or business-school partnership programs.

For the third component, the Chief Education Officer Leadership Institute, participants complete 10 days of training. Those who complete the training within the school year are eligible for a $1,000 salary supplement. Programs are held throughout the year on topics such as strategic planning, team building, assessor certification, the new superintendent, looking to the future, and educational leadership versus management.

The CEO institute also includes workshops on total quality management, high school restructuring, technology and instruction, societal issues, relations with school boards, the news media, and parent involvement. Focus seminars—designed to promote development of school reform initiatives—are offered periodically and require advance reading, small group participation, and policy recommendations to the state. An annual superintendents' study council conference is an additional activity of the CEO institute.

The Institute for Excellence in Education also provides a variety of leadership training opportunities for administrators through the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders, established in 1984 with the Comprehensive Education Reform Act. That legislation included a requirement that all administrators receive 72 hours of training every five years. The Tennessee Academy for School Leaders Board of Control is made up of practicing administrators and a representative from higher education. Academy sessions, serving 1,200 to 1,500 administrators, are scheduled many times throughout the school year and in the summer. All programs are designed to teach specific skills that participants can apply directly in their school systems. Topics include cultural diversity, computer technology for administrators, creating safe schools, developing effective teachers, team building, and school transformation. A program for beginning administrators is being implemented in 1995-96.

Tennessee also requires school board members to receive seven hours of training per year. Beginning board members must attend a two-day orientation prior to the training. Within a four-year period, school board members must complete a basic core of courses. These are Board Policy, Board-Superintendent Relations, Board Advocacy for Children, and Vision for Excellence. Elective modules include educational innovations, school board-community relations, school law, and school finance. Other modules, such as planning and team building, are integrated into other institute programs. Participating school board members receive a $75 stipend to cover expenses.

In conjunction with the Tennessee School Boards Association, the department of education has developed competency standards for the knowledge, skills, and attitudes school board members should attain. These standards will guide development of the training.

The state department of education is responsible for the design and development of the school board training program. At least 50 percent of the training is provided through the school boards association. The University of Tennessee Center for Government Training is also a co-sponsor.

Developing teachers as leaders is the primary focus of Teacher Leadership Development Programs. Academy programs focus on developing leadership capability within schools by shared decision-making, curriculum assessment and design, student assessment, school-based budgeting, program assessment, school research, and community involvement. Research-based school improvement programs are being implemented in approximately 100 schools.

While the state education department designs and develops all of its leadership programs, it hires consultants—mostly school practitioners—to deliver much of the training. National education consultants are involved in delivering assessment training and strategic planning for superintendents. The state department is evaluating the role of its statewide study council networks in delivering some training. Study councils for superintendents, principals, and teachers also exist.

The annual budget for the Tennessee Institute for Excellence in Education is $2.9 million. The institute has eight consultant/director positions and five professional support positions. Evaluation of the institute's training programs is based on the rate of participation and on participant satisfaction. A formal evaluation of the institute is being conducted by the University of Memphis in 1995-96.

Texas

Highlights:

- *An independent agency, The Texas Leadership Center, is the primary developer of training modules and coordinates delivery to local school agencies through 20 Texas Education Agency Regional Education Service Centers.*
- *TLC is funded by grants and contracts from TEA and the Texas Association of School Administrators.*

- *Early in its eight-year history, TLC formed a partnership with E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co. and developed its Leadership Development Process into a school-based model. A five-day program based on this model has been delivered to hundreds of vertical, school-based teams across Texas.*
- *TLC has trained and certified more than 1,000 trainers to deliver leadership training through the TEA regional service centers in total quality management and transformational leadership.*
- *In 1992, the legislature mandated that each district develop and implement a site-based management plan. TLC has concentrated its efforts on developing training materials focusing on systemic change.*
- *TEA operates several professional development and technology centers whose primary purpose is to assist administrators and teachers in integrating technology in teaching practices. TLC has assisted in this process.*

The Texas Leadership Center is a private, non-profit organization supported by the Texas Association of School Administrators, the center's primary source for operating funds. Although the center has received substantial funding for developmental projects through the Texas Education Agency, staff members are not state employees, but are employed directly by the center.

The center's board of directors and leadership advisory committee include representatives from the major administrator organizations, the TEA, school boards association, teachers' associations, the private sector, the governor's office, the statewide PTA organizations, the regional education service centers, and universities. The Texas Leadership Center was created in 1987 through the federal Leadership in Educational Administration Development (LEAD) Act.

As an independent agency, the center serves primarily as a research and development agency for education leadership training programs and modules. The education service centers and school districts look to the Texas Leadership Center as a major developer of quality leadership development training. Center staff, with input from practitioners in the field, identify or develop professional leadership programs from sources throughout the country, adapt the information to the state's needs, and disseminate the programs through an extensive train-the-trainer model. Trainers in the state's 20 educational service centers—agencies of the TEA—assist in delivering the training to the local districts and schools.

Its neutral, non-profit status has aided the Leadership Center in securing private-sector funding and assistance. Early in its history, the center developed a partnership with E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co. In 1988, Du Pont shared its Leadership Development Process, a vertical-team training program from its Chemical and Pigments Department, and assisted in modifying it for school leaders. The company's 10-day program was condensed into five days and delivered to school administrators. Now, it is delivered to vertical, school-based management teams and is considered a major resource for site-based decision-making teams engaged in school restructuring.

During the past seven years, more than 1,000 trainers have been certified in the program, which teaches transformational leadership at all levels of the organization, core collaborative decision-making, consensus building, planning, communication, and total quality management techniques and methods. The Du Pont program has evolved into the state's baseline leadership development training program. Quality is maintained through certification of trainers and through ongoing revision and upgrading that reflects new knowledge and input from the field. Periodically, a statewide evaluation of the program is conducted.

Since 1992, school reform in Texas has mandated that each school district develop site-based decision-making plans. As a result, the Leadership Center has concentrated its efforts in developing training materials aimed at facilitating systemic change, with funding provided through the TEA. The center has developed a two-phase package of technical assistance materials addressing goal-setting, curriculum, school organization, and staffing and budgeting patterns. The materials include scenarios on videotape and computer disk and are designed so that educational service centers and others can customize them to meet specific district needs.

For site-based decision making, the center also developed five training modules on collaborative decision-making skills, concepts and tools that are available for purchase through the National Staff Development Council. The center entered into a partnership with the International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution at Columbia University, preparing facilitators to deliver training in reaching agreement and resolving conflict. That program, titled Conflict Resolution: Strategies for Collaborative Problem Solving, is being delivered through education service centers, local school districts, and universities.

In 1994, the center received $200,000 from TEA to coordinate the development of a series of training modules on governance issues that commonly arise under site-based decision making and must be confronted by superintendents and school boards. Training materials, including facilitator manuals and three videotaped scenarios based on real governance issues, are being developed.

Other sources of statewide funding for leadership development are the Centers for Professional Development and Technology. More than $21 million has been appropriated for these centers. While their primary focus has been to integrate technology and innovative teaching practices in teacher preparation programs, leadership development of administrators and teachers is another goal. Through this initiative, a mentor program in the elementary, middle, and high schools identifies outstanding schools and provides staff development funds to help them share their innovative practices with other schools. The initiative provides leadership development for mentor and non-mentor schools alike.

In 1994, the TEA appropriated $200,000 to assist local school districts in Site-Based Decision-Making, and the additional $200,000 to develop training specifically on governance issues. In 1993, the center received $223,000 to develop and implement the Phase II SBDM Technical Assistance Strategies training materials, in collaboration with the Statewide SBDM Advisory Committee. These funds augmented $100,000 received in 1992 to develop the Phase I SBDM Technical Assistance Strategies materials. The agency is expecting additional support in 1995-96 from the Texas Association of School Administrators.

Virginia

Highlights:

- *The content of and strategies for leadership development in Virginia are primarily local district functions. The state has no leadership academy.*
- *The DOE has experienced considerable downsizing. Staff development positions were eliminated in 1993 in the face of strong public opposition to a proposed school reform effort.*
- *Superintendents are grouped into eight study groups statewide. They meet monthly, and these groups provide some leadership training. The chairman of each group meets monthly with the state superintendent.*
- *The Virginia Schools Boards Association trains board members, and the superintendents association provides the majority of training for superintendents.*
- *The DOE provides roughly half of the $219 per instructional position that local districts use for human resource development. That amount is expected to increase to $235 in 1996. Local districts control these funds. The state requires only that localities devote 10 days for professional development activities.*

The Standards of Quality, the Virginia code for education, compels local schools system superintendents to participate in professional development at local, state, and national levels each year. All other administrative personnel are also required to participate in in-service activities. Localities determine the form and content of these training activities. They plan, develop, and deliver the training or contract for the training to be delivered by outside organizations.

Virginia provides roughly half of the $219 per instructional position that the localities use for professional development. The total amount for professional development is $14 million, an amount that includes both state and local funding determined by a funding formula. Localities control use of the money. Virginia has no leadership academy.

For the 1996-98 biennium, funding for professional development is projected to increase to $235 per instructional position, or a total of $17 million. Virginia also is in the process of developing a three-year staff training plan for the state DOE staff.

The state has five field representatives who assist localities by providing information about professional development programs. Some compile resource directories of professional development programs. The state does not regulate or approve professional development programs offered by localities or outside organizations. It only requires that in addition to the 180-day school calendar, teachers and administrators must use 10 days for professional development.

Six of Virginia's universities collaborate to provide four regional service centers; primarily, they offer the National Association of Secondary School Principals' assessment, Leader 123, and Springfield programs. Upon request, the centers will design staff development programs for local divisions.

Established in 1988, these centers have been funded primarily through university budgets, with contributions from local school divisions that pay the cost of their assessments, and the state. In 1994, each center received $426,463 in university funding, $75,000 to $100,000 from local school divisions, and $26,463 in state funding. In 1995, state involvement in these programs ceased. Universities control the programs, and localities pay membership fees to participate. No state money is provided.

The Virginia School Boards Association provides school board training. The Virginia Association of School Superintendents provides the majority of training for superintendents. The state provides some in-service opportunities for superintendents and principals in the form of conferences and legislative convocations.

Superintendents are divided into eight study groups that meet once a month and include a professional development activity. In addition, the chairpersons of the eight study groups meet with the state superintendent once a month. Key instructional leaders, such as assistant superintendents for instruction and directors of instruction, also hold regular meetings that include professional development activities.

Training in Virginia currently focuses on five educational components: school safety, long-range planning, community and parental involvement, technology, and accountability. The state is formulating an accountability system based on uniform academic standards, an assessment process, a report card, and new accreditation standards.

In 1991, the Virginia Department of Education was reorganized. Staff was reduced from 450 positions to 400 and all staff development positions were eliminated. Eight staff development positions were re-created in 1992 and eliminated again in 1993 after the decision to terminate the reform effort known as the Common Core of Learning. In 1992-93, the state education department faced overwhelming public opposition to this reform program, which was an interdisciplinary and results-based approach to education. The plan was withdrawn. Since that time, the department was again reorganized, and the number of positions was reduced to 272.

West Virginia

Highlights:

- *West Virginia focuses its leadership development activities on school principals through two one-day update sessions each year.*
- *Practicing principals share successful strategies with their peers.*
- *Session topics are based on developments in state programs or requirements.*
- *The two-day program is funded at $100,000 through the state Department of Education budget.*

In West Virginia, leadership development activities are aimed primarily at principals and are provided in one-day sessions held twice a year and titled Principal Seminars. Practicing West Virginia principals lead discussions by sharing successful practices and programs from schools with their peers.

The informational, one-day programs are held in the fall and spring. Leaders in the West Virginia Department of Education determine the topics to be covered based on the state's education objectives. Emphasis is on providing current information, including legislative and policy activities.

During the 1994-95 school year, one topic of discussion was inclusion in special education, and principals from schools employing inclusionary practices provided specific successful examples. Principals also discussed the state's *High Schools That Work* program, and practitioners spoke on ways to successfully implement that program. The state's safe schools legislation and its implementation also was discussed.

The state does not require principals to attend the seminars, but some local superintendents do require participation. The principal seminars are also open to assistant principals, central office staff, and vocational administrators. In 1994-95, between 700 and 1,100 educators attended each seminar. The sessions are conducted in each of eight geographical service areas and are held on regular work days. The principal seminars are evaluated by collecting participant feedback through evaluation forms.

For 1994 and 1995, the principal seminars were funded at $100,000. In 1994, funds came from a legislative line item. In 1995, the money was not appropriated. The program is currently funded by the state department's budget at $100,000. Overall professional development funding in 1995 decreased, and a three-day summer program for principals was eliminated.

Semi-annual retreats focusing on current information and updates are held for district superintendents and are sponsored by the state superintendent.

Appendix A: State Directors of Leadership Programs

Alabama: Elizabeth Cheshire, Assistant Director, Educational Leadership Development, State of Alabama, Department of Education, 5241 Gordon Persons Building, 50 North Ripley St., Montgomery, AL, 36130-3901; (334) 242-8176; FAX: (334) 242-9708

Arkansas: Beverly Reed, Director, Arkansas Academy for Leadership Training and School-Based Management, 153 Graduate Education Building, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701; (501) 575-3030; FAX: (501) 575-8663

Florida: Luther Rogers, Associate Executive Director, Florida Association of District School Superintendents, P.O. Box 1108, Tallahassee, FL 32302-1108; (904) 222-2280; FAX: (904) 921-5273

Georgia: Russell Cook, Director, Leadership Academy, Georgia Department of Education, 1862 Twin Towers East, Atlanta, GA 30334-5030; (404) 656-4629; (404) 657-7646

Kentucky: Audrey T. Carr, Director, Kentucky Department of Education Division of Professional Development, 500 Mero St., Frankfort, KY 40601; (502) 564-2672; FAX: (502) 564-6952

Louisiana: Barbara Dunbar, Director, Administrative Leadership Academy, Louisiana Department of Education, P.O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064; (504) 342-3483; FAX: (504) 342-4474

Maryland: Gaye E. Brown, Chief, Staff Development Branch, Division of Instruction and Staff Development; Maryland State Department of Education, 200 W. Baltimore St., Baltimore, MD 21201; (410) 767-0381; FAX: (410) 333-2379

Mississippi: Catherine Wasson, Director, Professional Development, Office of Academic Education, Mississippi Department of Education, Walter Sillers Office Building, Suite 803; P.O. Box 771, Jackson, MS, 39205-0771; (601) 359-3506; FAX (601) 359-3712

North Carolina: Department of Public Instruction, 301 North Wilmington St., Raleigh, NC 27601-2825; (919) 715-1000; FAX (919) 715-1278.

Oklahoma: Ramona Emmons Paul, Assistant State Superintendent, Professional Services Division, Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2500 N. Lincoln Blvd., Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4599; (405) 521-4311; (405) 521-6205

South Carolina: Russell Bedenbaugh, Director, South Carolina Department of Education Office of Professional Development; 1429 Senate St., Room 1112, Columbia, SC 29201; (803) 734-8558; FAX: (803) 734-4387

Tennessee: Roger Bynum, Director, Institute of Excellence in Education, 5th Floor Gateway Plaza, 710 James Robertson Parkway, Nashville, TN 37243-0375; (615) 532-4721; FAX: (615) 532-7860

Texas: Joan Burnham, Executive Director, Texas Leadership Center, 406 E. 11th St., Austin, TX 78701-2617; (512) 477-9014; FAX (512) 482-8658

Virginia: M. Kenneth Magill, Division Chief, Administration, Virginia Department of Education, P.O. Box 2120, Richmond, VA 23216-2120; (804) 225-2073; FAX (804) 786-5389

West Virginia: Karen K. Larry, Acting Assistant Director, Office of Professional Development, West Virginia Department of Education, Building 6, Room 252, 1900 Kanawha Blvd. East, Charleston, WV 25305-0330; (304) 558-2702; (304) 558-0882